

REMARKS

Claim rejections under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-20, 44, and 46-47 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs. The subject matter of the claims that triggered the rejection was the subject matter that Applicant added to the claims in the prior office action response, “wherein the at least one operation comprises automatically activating the electronic camera, *without user interaction*, to produce the image signal, the image signal representing a still digital photography.” Applicant has without prejudice amended the claims to remove this previously added subject matter therefrom, rendering these rejections moot.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 3-5, and 11-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metcalfe (AU 743216) in view of Takahashi (2002/0041757), and further in view of Mann (6,614,408). Claims 2 and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metcalfe, Takahashi, and Mann, and further in view of Matsumoto (6,795,642). Claims 40 and 42 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metcalfe in view of Takahashi, and further in view of Matsumoto. Claims 44 and 46-47 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of Mann.

Claims 1, 40, and 44 are independent claims, from which the remaining pending claims ultimately depend. Applicant respectfully submits that as amended, claims 1, 40, and 44 are patentable over the prior art of record in combination. As such, the remaining pending claims are patentable at least because they depend from patentable base independent claims.

Claim 40 is discussed herein as representative of all three independent claims, insofar as the present rejections are concerned. Claim 40 has been amended to recite “replay circuitry to replay the image signal *such that portions of the image signal having saliency signal values*

below a threshold are played back in an accelerated manner for accelerated viewing thereof.” Applicant refers the Examiner to point 2 on page 10 of the specification in this regard.

Applicant has reviewed Metcalfe, Takahashi, Mann, and Matsumoto, and cannot locate this added subject matter in any of these references. As a first example, Takahashi suggests that portions of the image signal having saliency signal values below a threshold are simply discarded (see, e.g., para. [0094]). As a second example, Metcalfe suggests that portions of the image signal having saliency signal values below a threshold are not output (see, e.g., bottom of p. 6, through top of p. 7). As a third example, Mann suggests that portions of the image signal having saliency signal values below a threshold are just not recorded in the first place (see, e.g., col. 12, ll. 40-64). As a fourth example, Matsumoto suggests that portions of the image signal having saliency signal values below a threshold are recorded at a greater compression level (see, e.g., col. 3, l. 15, through col. 4, l. 19).

Therefore, none of the prior art of record suggests that the portions of the image signal having saliency signal values below a threshold are played back *in an accelerated manner*, in contradistinction to the claimed invention, as amended. As such, no combination of the prior art of record rises to the level of suggesting the subject matter of the independent claims, as amended. Applicant thus respectfully submits that the independent claims, as amended, are patentable over any combination of the cited prior art of record.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael A. Dryja", written over a horizontal line.

October 24, 2010
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
1230 E Baseline Rd #103-248
Mesa, AZ 85204
tel: 480-463-4837
fax: 480-371-2110